

REMARKS

The rejection is respectfully traversed. The office action fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness because the references clearly do not disclose each element of the claimed invention, in the manner alleged by the examiner or otherwise.

The office action acknowledges that neither Whitecar nor Matsumoto discloses determining “which type” of speaker is connected, and alleges that Porambo discloses this feature, citing the description in Porambo of determining which of the “left front 16, left rear 18, right front 20, and right rear 22” speakers are present. Simply put, “left front” and similar descriptions are clearly *locations*, not *types* of speakers.

Even if different types of speakers are used in different locations, Porambo does not suggest that the system can recognize which types they are. Moreover, even if different types of speakers were used in the front and rear of a car, it would be highly unusual to expect different types of speakers in the left and right positions, thus Porambo’s mention of all four locations further confirms that it is concerned with *location*, not *type*.

Nothing in Porambo suggests that the system described is capable of determining anything more than whether speakers are correctly installed in each location; nothing suggests determining which type of speaker is in each location. In particular, the cited portion of Porambo discusses using impedance measurements to determine only whether “the conductors 76 and 78 form a complete circuit” (col. 5, ll. 27-28). While the impedance to set the threshold may depend on properties of the speakers, it is clearly used only to detect normal, short, or open circuits. There is no mention or suggestion of using the impedance to determine the *type* of the speaker. As neither Porambo nor any of the other cited references discloses determining the type of a speaker, they cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

The claims are patentable over the cited references for the reasons previously presented, i.e., none of the references, alone or in combination, describe determining which type of speaker is connected. The detailed analysis of the cited references, presented in the previous two replies, remains valid and is not repeated here.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please charge additional claims fees and any other required fees to Bose Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-4282, referencing matter no W39-US.

In view of the above remarks, the applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: March 25, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Misha K. Hill/
Misha K. Hill
Registration No.: 59,737
BOSE CORPORATION
The Mountain, MS 40
IP Legal - Patent Support
Framingham, Massachusetts 01701
(508) 215-0403
Attorney for Applicant